



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,204	03/12/2004	Steven Van der Hoeven	FORT1100	2510
44654	7590	08/24/2007	EXAMINER	
SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP			TAKELE, MESEKER	
1301 W. 25TH STREET				
SUITE 408				
AUSTIN, TX 78705				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,204

Applicant(s)

VAN DER HOEVEN, STEVEN

Examiner

Meseker Takele

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2007.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03/12/2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed June 1, 2007.
2. Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 21 and 28-31 are independent claims. In the instant Amendment, claims 1-4, 6-9, 14, 16, 21, 23-24 and 28-31 were amended.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because "Prior Art" drawing shown as "Figure 1". "Figure 1" should be "Prior Art". Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
3. Claims 9-11, 20-22 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant described in the specification on paragraph [0012] under the "Summary of the Invention" the set of zones comprises a set of interkey zones and a set of key zones, wherein no two key zones are contiguous, and each key zone is contiguous with at least one interkey zone. In applicant's amendment on Claims 9-11, 20-22 and 24-29,

Art Unit: 2174

applicant claimed "a first zone corresponding to the initial press and a second zone corresponding to the release".

The subset feature is not mentioned in the remarks nor does it appear in the specification. Applicants amended and add the claims over the art without referencing the specification.

Therefore, it is concluded that:

(a) the specification does not describe "a first zone corresponding to the initial press and a second zone corresponding to the release" for the newly added features of claims 9-11, 20-22 and 24-29

(b) the drawings do not describe "First and Second zone" by drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 24 – 26 and 27 - 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Panagrossi (US Patent Number 6,104,317).

As to claim 24, Panagrossi discloses a method for an interface for data entry (example, interface, data entry, see column 1, line 6 and Figure 5), comprising:
detecting an input with respect to the interface wherein detecting the input (example, identifies a key input, see abstract) comprises:
detecting a press in a first zone of a set of zones (example, pen down, see column 2, line 50-56 and Figure 6),

detecting a release in a second zone of the set of zones (example, pen down, see column 2, line 50-56 and Figure 6)

and detecting a movement between the press and release (example, direction of the flick entry, see column 3, line 2) (example pen-up and pen-down positions, movement, see column 4, lines 50-55),

wherein detecting the movement further comprises detecting entering or leaving one or more of the set of zones between the press in the first zone and the release in the second zone (example dragging away from the pointing device in any of eight compass directions, See column 2, lines 34-35 and figure 4b) and

contact is maintained with the interface between the press in the first zone and the release in the second zone (see Figure 6 (element 22, 24, 25, 21); and associating a semantic meaning with the input based on a set of semantic meanings associated with the first zone (such as , identifies a key input region in which a stroke is entered and measures parameters of the entered stroke, see abstract) wherein the semantic meaning is selected from the set of semantic meanings based on the second zone (example, abc, def and ghi ,see Figure 1 and 2).

As to claim 25, Panagrossi discloses wherein associating a semantic meaning with the input comprises:

grouping each of the set of zones into one of a set of selection zones (example, abc, def and ghi, see Figure 1 and 2),

wherein each of the set of selection zones is associated with a corresponding one of the set of semantic meanings associated with the first zone (example, abc, def and ghi, see Figure 1 and 2; and

determining which of the set of selection zones the second zone is associated with (example, determine, see col., 4 lines, 37-43).

As to claim 26, Panagrossi discloses wherein each of the set of semantic meanings is displayed on the interface in conjunction with the first zone (example, pqrs, tuv, wxyz, see Figure 1) wherein each of the set of semantic meanings is displayed in a corresponding location of the first zone and each of the set of selection zones corresponds with one of the corresponding locations (example, 123, 456, 789, see Figure 1).

6. Claims 27-29 are similar in scope to claims 24-26 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 9-11, 12, 20-22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panagrossi (US Patent Number 6,104,317) in view of Hirshberg (US Pub No.: 2002/0027549).

As to claim 1, Panagrossi disclose, a method for an interface (example, interface, see Figure 5) for data entry (example data entry, see column 1, line 6) comprising detecting an initial press (example, pen down, see column 2, line 50-56 and figure 6) detecting a release (example, pen up, see column 2, line 56-60 and figure 6) detecting a movement between the press and release (example, direction of the flick entry, see

Art Unit: 2174

column 3, line 2) (example pen-up and pen-down positions, movement, see column 4, lines 50-55) wherein detecting the movement further comprises detecting entering or leaving one or more of a set of zones (example dragging away from the pointing device in any of eight compass directions, See column 2, lines 34-35 and figure 4b), the movement and the release into a discrete message (column 3, lines 36-54).

However Panagrossi does not disclose Normalizing the initial press is based on one of the set of zones and a row corresponding to the one of the set of zones.

Hirshberg from the same field of endeavor disclose Normalizing the initial press is based on one of the set of zones and a row corresponding to the one of the set of zones (example, divided into two zones, display zone and text entry and the soft keys zones, row of keys, see Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Panagrossi's data entry device with zones and row as presented by Hirshberg.

The motivation to combine to provide a multifunctional keypad implemented using a touch screen, and a corresponding method for operating a keypad.

As to claim 9, Panagrossi disclose wherein the discrete message contains a first zone corresponding to the initial press (example, pen down, see column 2, line 50-56 and figure 6) and a second zone corresponding to the release (example, pen up, see column 2, line 56-60 and figure 6).

As to claim 10, Panagrossi disclose, associating a semantic meaning with the discrete message (see column 2, lines 32-41 and figure 4B).

As to claim 11, Panagrossi disclose, wherein the initial press is in the first zone (example, pen down, see column 2, line 50-56 and figure 6) and the release is in the second zone (example, pen up, see column 2, line 56-60 and figure 6) (example region, see column 3, lines 24-29 and figure 7).

9. Claim 12, 20-22 are similar in scope to claim 1, 9-11 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 23, Panagrossi discloses a system for an interface for data entry (example, interface, data entry, see column 1, line 6 and Figure 5), comprising
a sensor (such as digitizer, see abstract) operable for:
detecting an initial press; (example, pen down, see column 2, line 50-56 and figure 6);
detecting a release (example, pen up, see column 2, line 50-56 and figure 6);
detecting a movement between the press and release (example, pen down, pen up, see column 2, column 4, lines 50-55 and figure 6), wherein detecting the movement further comprises detecting entering or leaving one or more of a set of zones implemented with the sensor (example dragging away from the pointing device in any of eight compass directions, digitizer, see column 2, lines 34-35, lines, 53 and Figure 6); and
logic operable for: the movement and the release into a semantic meaning based upon a context associated with each of the zones (see column 2, lines 32-41 and figure 4B).

However Panagrossi does not disclose Normalizing the initial press.

Hirshberg from the same field of endeavor disclose Normalizing the initial press (example, such as after one letter activation the letters will change back to capitals and highlighted label will go back to its normal state, see paragraph [0066]).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modify the modified Panagrossi's data entry device with normal state as presented by Hirshberg.

The motivation to combine will provide multifunction keypad which would not require great precision of use and which could be conveniently and effectively operated by use of the finger.

10. Claims 2-8 and 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panagrossi (US Patent Number 6,104,317) in view of Hirshberg (US Pub No.: 2002/0027549) and further in view of Luo (US Patent No.: (6,378,234).

As to claim 2, Panagrossi does not disclose, wherein the set of zones comprises a set of interkey zones and a set of key zones, wherein no two key zones are contiguous, and each key zone is contiguous with at least one interkey zone.

Luo from the same field of endeavor disclose, the set of zones comprises a set of interkey zones and a set of key zones, wherein no two key zones are contiguous, and each key zone is contiguous with at least one interkey zone (see column 4, lines 22-39 and Figure 1 (element 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the modified Panagrossi's data entry interface with at least one interkey zone as presented by Luo.

The motivation to combine to provide a delimiting key which, stroked after stroking two other keys in sequence, indicates that said two keys are linked and the character associated with that sequentially linked pair of key strokes is desired. This

Art Unit: 2174

method enables single keystrokes to be recognized as pertaining to another particular character as well.

As to claim 3, Luo discloses, wherein the set of zones is arranged in a set of rows (example rows, see column 4, line 22-39 and see figure 1).

As to claim 4, Luo discloses, the set of rows forms at least one concentric curve.

As to claim 5, Luo discloses, wherein each row has a key zone at each end, and there is an interkey zone between each key zone in the row (see column 4, lines 22-39, column, 13, lines 36-48, Figure 19 and Figure 1).

As to claim 6, Luo discloses, wherein each interkey zone overlaps with at least the two adjacent key zones with which it is contiguous (see column 4, lines 11-39 and abstract).

As to claim 7, Luo discloses, wherein every part of each interkey zone is associated with one of the at least two adjacent key zones with which it is contiguous (see abstract).

As to claim 8, Luo discloses, wherein the association is based on the movement (see column 3, lines 53-57).

11. Claims 13-19 are similar in scope to claims 2-8 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2174

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meseker Takele whose telephone number is (571) 270-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30AM- 5:00PM est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MT

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100